

Joseph Rogers

THE
EVANGELIST.

VOL. I.

AUGUST, 1824.

No. 8.

CONTENTS.

The Son of God worthy of Reverence,	281	New Denomination,	310
Confidence in God,	288	Exhibition of Unitarianism,	312
On Union in Religious Worship,	294	Obituary—Hon. Jesse Root,	313
On a False Gospel,	301	Aphorisms,	319
Divine Decrees,	303	Anecdotes,	ib.
On imprudent Speaking,	307	Poetry,	320
		To Correspondents,	ib.

AGENTS.

Middletown, Mr. E. B. Tompkins; Westfield Society, Rev. S. Hayes; New-Haven, A. H. Maltby & Co.; Berlin, Worthington Society, Lewis Edwards; New-Britain, Deacon David Whittlesey; East-Hartford, Rev. J. H. Fairchild; Wethersfield, Richard Robbins; Colchester, W. T. Turner; East-Windsor, Jesse Charlton; Windsor, Rev. H. A. Rowland; Glastenbury, Rev. C. Burge; Chatham, Rev. H. Talcott; Wintonbury, Rev. J. Bartlett; Westchester, Deacon Cone; Ellington, Charles Sexton; Somers, Ebenezer Clark; Lebanon, Denison Wattles, Jr. Esq.; Bozrah, D. L. Dodge; Norwich, Horace Colton; Lyme, Riverhead, Rev. Mr. St. John; Stonington, Rev. Ira Hart; Simsbury, Rev. Allen McLean; Haddam, James Clark; Columbia, Rev. David Dickinson.

HARTFORD:

PUBLISHED BY P. B. GOODSSELL.

1824.

THE EVANGELIST.

VOL. I.

AUGUST, 1824.

[No. 8.]

FOR THE EVANGELIST.

THE SON OF GOD WORTHY OF REVERENCE.

They will reverence my Son.—This is represented as the language of God, in respect to the manner, in which his beloved Son should be received among men. Its primary application was more especially and immediately intended for the Jews. But, like all inspired scripture, it was, also, designed for all others, the circumstances of whose case are such, as render its application proper. It is, indeed, the language of parable; but that such was its design, is very obvious. God had long been very kind, and very gracious, to his people. He had plainly taught them the right and the good way. He had favored them with many valuable and precious privileges. And he had called upon them to make some suitable returns for all his kindness. To this reasonable call, they had turned a deaf ear. This reasonable requirement, they had ungratefully rejected. He had sent unto them, from time to time, many important messages, by his servants the prophets. But so far had they been from hearing and regarding these messages, that they even abused the servants, who were sent; beating some, and killing some. And now, last of all, he had sent among them his beloved Son, the real and proper Heir of all things; by whom, also the worlds were made. To impress this subject, deeply, on the minds of his hearers, our Lord addressed them, on one occasion, in his own inimitably beautiful manner, in this parabolical language. “A certain man planted a vineyard, and set an hedge about it, and digged a place for the wine-fat, and built a tower, and let it out to husbandmen, and went into a far country. And at the season he sent unto the husbandmen a servant, that he might receive from the husbandmen of the fruit of the vineyard. And they caught him, and beat him, and sent him away empty. And again, he sent unto them another servant; and at him they cast stones, and wounded him in the head, and sent him away shamefully handled. And again he sent another; and him they killed, and many others; beating some, and killing some. Having, therefore one son, his well beloved, he sent him also last unto them, saying, *they will reverence my son.*”

He who planted the vineyard, was evidently designed to represent the great God. The vineyard itself, seems designed, here, to represent the precious privileges, which God had granted to his people. A suitable improvement of these, would have ensured to them an am-

ple harvest of happiness. The husbandmen represented the Jews. The fruits of the vineyard represent those grateful and obedient returns, which should ever be made, for mercies received. They represent that holiness of heart and life, which people, so highly favored, should always render to the Lord. And the servants represent the Lord's messengers, by whom he had sent, from time to time, to urge his people to bring forth this fruit; but whom they had wickedly abused, and sometimes cruelly persecuted even unto death. But, after all, instead of coming out against them, "in judgement, to destroy them" at once, as he might justly have done, the Lord would make one effort more. Having yet, therefore, one son, his well beloved, he sent him, also, last unto them, saying, "*They will reverence my son.*"

God is omniscient. His knowledge is boundless. Nothing occurs, which he did not foresee. No event takes place which he did not expect. When, therefore, he is represented as sending by his servants, to mankind, to receive the fruits of his vineyard, as if, in expectation that the proper return would be made; and when it appears, that, instead of making this return, they beat one, and kill another, we are not to conclude, that God is really disappointed. Far from it. He knows beforehand, how his servants will be treated. But such representations are designed to show what might, in the nature of things, be reasonably expected, in such cases. So, when he is represented as resolving to send his son, after all the ill treatment, which his servants had received, saying, "*They will reverence my son,*" we are not to understand it, as determining what will take place, in fact; but, merely as expressive of what *ought* to take place; and what, in the circumstances of the case, might be reasonably expected. He speaks, not in respect to what he knows; but of what, it would be reasonable and natural to expect, if he did not know. On this ground, though they have most wickedly abused his servants, he is still represented, as indulging a reasonable expectation, that, when his own son appears among them, they will relent, and treat him in a becoming manner. They will reverence my son. They will treat him with some suitable respect. They will hear his calls. They will turn at his reproof. They will, at last, render the fruit of the vineyard.

Though the parable had, evidently, a primary application to the Jews, who were, at that time, the most favored people on earth, and among whom the Son of God made his personal appearance; yet, unquestionably, it now applies, and in some respects, *equally*, to all who are favored with the light of the gospel. Giving the subject this extensive latitude, and laying parable aside, let us proceed to enquire, whether the expectation expressed, is not a reasonable one. "*They will reverence my son.*"

"The world," says an excellent preacher, "had gone on 4000 years in wickedness, in spite of all the means used for its reformation, by lawgivers, prophets, and the providence of God. Persuasions, warnings, chastisements, mercies, and whatever had a tendency to bring them to repentance, had been often used with them. Philosophers had often reasoned; legislatures had prescribed; prophets had carefully instructed, allured with promises, deterred with threatenings, and carried their heavenly credentials in their hand; angels had appeared, and conversed with men, upon extraordinary occasions; Jesus, the great angel of the covenant, had given frequent preludes of his incarnation; nay, Jehovah himself had appeared, and published

his law, with God-like pomp, in the ears of his subjects, on Mount Sinai. But all this would not do. The world sinned on still, impenitent and incorrigible. And what shall be done in such a desperate case? What expedient remains to be tried? After so many messengers abused, persecuted, and killed, who will go upon so dangerous a message again? There is, indeed, the Son of God; if he would undertake it, perhaps something might be done! But, O! who can hope for such condescension, from one so high? Who can expect such a favor, for rebels ripe for vengeance? Who can hope the Father will give him up? He is his son; his well beloved son, and he has but one son; but one of his rank, though he has made so many worlds. And will he part with his son, his well beloved, his only son, and send him upon such a mission? A mission so difficult, so dangerous, in which so many of his servants have lost their lives? Who would believe that even divine love and mercy could go so far, had we not the testimony of God in the gospel for it? Having one son, his well beloved, he sent him also; he sent even him, dear as he was, as well as his servants, of an inferior order. So much had he at heart the salvation of his rebellious creatures! But observe the time when he sent him. He sent him *last*. He did not send him, until every other method had been tried in vain. Hence we are led to make this remark, which is of great importance to a right understanding of the gospel; that the son of God was sent into the world as a Saviour, in a desperate case. It was when the only hope, of a ruined world, depended on his coming. It was when no sacrifice but his could take away sin. Angels, if disposed for the undertaking, were infinitely unable to sustain the mighty work. A world of sins were to be borne. A race, already condemned, were to be redeemed. The injured justice of the great Jehovah was to be honored. His laws of eternal rectitude were to be supported. His mercy and grace, in their divinest forms, were to be displayed and magnified. Heirs of perdition were to be snatched from deserved wrath, and translated into the kingdom of glory. The case is indeed desperate. None but God's beloved and equal son is possessed of power to save, equal to the arduous undertaking. In view of the urgency, importance, difficulty, and danger of the case, the Divine Son condescended to engage. He cheerfully met the Father's proposal: "Lo, I come," said he, "in the volume of thy book it is written of me, I delight to do thy will, O God." He, also, declared, when he came, that his object, in coming, was, "to seek and to save that which was lost;" evidently implying, that the case, in which he came, was so desperate, that those, who were lost, could never have been saved in any other way. Surely, then, God might reasonably say, "They will reverence my Son." But let us consider some things a little more particularly. Consider,

1. The dignity, the glory, and the majesty of the Being, who sends his Son. Should an earthly sovereign, especially, should an earthly sovereign, who *reigns in righteousness*; who enacts only wise and good laws, and aims to have judgement and justice impartially administered, and to secure the happiness of his people; should such an one send his son, on some important errand to any of his subjects, might it not be reasonably expected, that this son would be treated with great respect and reverence? Would not this expectation, if possible, still

become stronger, if it evidently appeared that this prince was sent among these subjects, for the sake of their own interest and advantage? Who would not suppose, that his message would be attentively regarded? But the case before us is stronger than this. It is the great God, who is king of kings, and lord of lords; whose dominion extends to all worlds and creatures; who sends his beloved son to some of the subjects of his universal empire. It is he, who is infinite in glory, in dignity, in excellency, and in majesty; who is good, and doeth good, and whose tender mercies are over all his works. It is he, before whom angels veil their faces, under a consciousness of unworthiness to behold his infinite excellence. This is the being, who sends his son to his creatures, with the most important message. May he not then reasonably expect, may he not well say, "They will reverence my Son?"

2. Consider, also, the dignity, and glory, and loveliness, of him who is sent. If God, the supreme majesty of heaven and earth, condescends to send a message to one of his creatures, though it were by the very meanest of all his servants, might it not still be expected that the messenger would be treated with respectful attention; it not for his own sake, yet for the sake of him who sent him? Coming with his credentials in his hand, from the king of kings, who shall dare to treat him with inattention and disrespect? Who will presume that his sovereign will not resent such an affront, as being virtually offered to himself? Who would not expect, that he, who should despise the servant, would be considered as despising him who sent him? But, now, he who is sent, is not a person of mean or unimportant character. He is a person, possessing in his own underived nature, transcendent dignity, unbounded glory, and infinite worth. He is a person entitled, on his own account, as well as for the sake of him who sends him, to profound reverence, the most respectful attention, and affectionate regard. It is the son of God, the well beloved of the Father. It is he, in whom it hath pleased the Father that all fullness should dwell. It is he, who was in the beginning, who was with God, and who was God, by whom all things were made that are made. It is he, who is, himself, the brightness of the Father's glory, and express image of his person; who declared that he and his Father were one, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God. It is he, whom all the angels of God are commanded to worship. It is he, whom men are commanded to honor even as they honor the Father. It is he, whom angels and the redeemed in heaven actually worship and honor, in the same strains of rapturous homage and adoration, which they render unto God; ascribing equal honor, and power, and dominion, and glory, to him that sitteth upon the throne, and to the Lamb, forever and ever. This is the exalted person who is sent. Nor does he come, without bringing irresistible evidence of his transcendent dignity and glory. With the fulness of the Godhead, dwelling bodily in him, he comes, exercising the power and authority of underived Deity. Miraculous works are wrought by him, in attestation of his claims. The most stubborn and inveterate diseases obey his mighty word; stormy winds, and foaming billows become quiet, when he commands, and even the dead hear his mandate, and awake to life. To these works he constantly appeals as evidence of his high authority. "The works that I do, they bear witness of

me." Nor is this all. The Father from heaven confirms his testimony. Once and again is the voice of God heard from the excellent glory, "This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased." Surely, then, the Father might well say, "They will reverence my son." But,

3. Consider the character of those to whom he is sent. Should God send a message by one of the meanest, to one of the most exalted of his servants, it might reasonably be expected, that even this humble servant would be treated with respectful attention, for the sake of him by whom he is sent. But, how much more, if he sends to his most exalted servant by his own dear Son? Shall not even Michael, or Gabriel, feel highly honored by such attention? And would they not, assuredly, treat the Son of God with the profoundest reverence and respect? But, to whom does God send his beloved son? Is it some high order of angels around the throne? Is it to creatures highly exalted in dignity, who are really worthy of such attention? No: it is to man. Not, to man, in his primeval state of innocence and honor; but to fallen, rebellious, and guilty man. Yes, it is to man, when the crown has fallen from his head, and his glory is departed. It is to man, when plunged into shame, guilt, and ruin. It is to man, when he has become an enemy to his God, by wicked works, and rendered himself deserving of his almighty frowns and indignation forever. It is even more; to man, when he has already rejected many messages, designed for his own good, to recover him from his ruined state, and not only rejected the messages, but cruelly mocked the messengers who were sent, beating some and killing some. It is to man, therefore, when he has plunged himself most *deeply* into guilt and ruin, is deserving of the damnation of hell, and lies at the mercy of his insulted and offended Sovereign. It is to man, in this state of guilt, of degradation, and of ruin, that God is pleased to send his beloved Son, whom all the angels worship. What expectation, then, can be more reasonable, than that expressed in the parable, "They will reverence my son?"

4. Consider in what manner and for what purpose he comes. If God has sent his Son into the world for judgement, arrayed in forms of terror, and for the purpose, only, of executing vengeance upon his enemies, who, even then, might not be expected to treat him with reverential awe? Who might not be expected to cast themselves submissively at his feet, and humbly plead for divine mercy and forbearance? But lo he comes in a very different manner. He comes for a very different purpose. He comes arrayed in no vengeance. "No terror clothes his brow." No lightnings flash in his eye. No thunders roll at his feet. But he comes, a messenger of peace and love.

All was mercy, all was mild,
And wrath stood silent by;
When Christ was sent with pardons down,
To rebels doomed to die."

He comes, a heavenly instructor in the things of God. He comes, a benefactor to the world,—performing works of kindness and mercy. He comes, not merely to proclaim salvation to a ruined race, but to effect salvation for those to whom he is sent. For God sent not his

Son into the world, to condemn the world ; but, that the world through him, might be saved. God so loved the world, as to give his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him, might not perish, but have everlasting life. He came, indeed, calling for the fruits of the vineyard. That is, urging men to repent, and bring forth fruits meet for repentance. But to this, he held out the greatest possible encouragement. He even promised everlasting life to all who would comply. He came to take away the sin of the world, and to seek and to save that which was lost. He came, clothed with humility, and ornamented with meekness, exhibiting a lovely example of the temper and practice which he inculcated upon others ; and giving assurance of eternal life, to all who would truly follow him. Is it, then, too much to expect, that such a great, glorious, and lovely person, coming to such rebellious and unworthy creatures, and for a purpose, so kind, so benevolent, so full of mercy and love, should be treated with the most respectful attention and regard ? May not the Father well say, " They will reverence my Son ?"

When we consider the unworthiness of our guilty world, and the dignity and glory of the Son of God, we are almost lost in wonder, that he should ever be willing to undertake such an errand. Let it have been proposed, beforehand, to any intelligent creature, whether the Son of God would undertake the cause of creatures so guilty, and would he scarcely have believed it possible ? But, let it be proposed to any such creature, and let him suppose he would undertake, and what would be his immediate conclusion, with respect to the manner in which he would be received ? Let the inquiry be thus proposed ; suppose he *should* undertake. Suppose he should leave the highest heavens, his Father's court, the adoration of angels, and all the glories of the upper world, and condescend to be found in fashion as a man, assume the humble form of a servant, hold converse with sinful worms, and be subjected to toils, and pains, and sufferings, and death itself, for their salvation ! Suppose, that *wonders* like these, *should* take place, in what manner will he be received among men ? Would he not say, Surely, it must be expected, that he will be received with the utmost readiness, with the most profound respect, and with the liveliest emotions of gratitude and joy ! Every heart, surely, will glow with fervent gratitude and love ; and every mouth will be open to speak his praise, and the praise of the Father who sent him. Yes, surely, Jews and Gentiles will, at once, abandon their traditions and idolatries, and flock around his standard, to receive him as their king. Every heart will make him welcome. Every soul will breathe new life, at the news of his arrival. And swift messengers will be sent, from nation to nation, to announce the glad tidings of peace on earth, to congratulate the nations on their deliverance from sin, and bid the world to a feast of love. Such grace, too, will swell the songs of every mouth, and inspire a universal anthem of praise. Such astonishing grace and goodness, to a guilty world, must surely melt the heart of the hardest rebel into deep contrition, and bring the most froward sinner on his knees before him, as a humble suppliant for mercy. Surely, overcome by such a wonderful display of love, they will penitently bewail their past ingratitude and disobedience. Surely, in future, they will most cheerfully render the fruit of unfeigned obedience in due season." Such

would have been the decided opinion of any disinterested, rational creature. As one observes, God speaks, in the text, after the manner of men; and therefore, when he says, "They will reverence my son," it intimates, that this would be the universal expectation of mankind, and of all rational creatures, who consider only the reasonableness of the thing. They will reverence my son; surely they will. Wicked and ungrateful as they are, they cannot be so lost to all sense of reason, propriety, and fitness of things, but that the very sight of him must melt them into gratitude and obedience. Though they have rejected, persecuted, and murdered prophets, and lawgivers, and others of my servants, They will reverence my son. And is it not, indeed, a most reasonable expectation? Who would apprehend the contrary, in a case so plain? Who would fear that such a Saviour, a Saviour Divine in all his attributes, the very being who created the world, and one who is possessed of all possible excellence and perfection; a Saviour in such a desperate case, a Saviour for those, who, without him, are completely and eternally ruined; who could think that a Saviour of this character, and in these circumstances, would be treated with neglect? Who would think, that sinners, on the very brink of endless destruction, would be inattentive to such a deliverer?

Christian readers, when you look back to the time when the Son of God actually appeared in the flesh among the Jews; when you consider the manner and the design of his appearance; when you consider who he was, and what he did and said, do you not perceive abundant reason, why he should be received with reverence? If you were made acquainted with these things, without being informed of the manner, *in which he was received*, would you not certainly conclude, that he must have been bidden a universal welcome, and treated with universal respect and reverence? Are you not all ready to say, Let him appear among us, as he appeared among the Jews; let God, in the same manner, send his beloved Son to us, and we, surely, will thus receive him. Yes, we will treat his person and his instructions with the most reverential regard. We will attend carefully on his ministry; we will accept his invitations; we will turn at his reproofs; we will walk in his commands; we will be his disciples indeed; we will most thankfully accept his great salvation. Yes, concerning us, God might truly say, not as expressive of what might reasonably be expected; but as expressive of what would certainly take place; "They will reverence my Son." I would ask you, whether you are not, this moment, indulging some such apprehensions as these? Are you willing to admit, that you might, probably, conduct in a different manner, and even in an opposite manner? Are you willing to admit, if the Son of God were sent among you, that really you would treat him with no reverence; with no suitable respect; but that, on the other hand, you would reject and despise him? After all, when you say you would reverence the Son of God, were he sent among you, could God any more than say of you, as of Israel of old, "O that there were such an heart in them!" For, after all, do you, indeed, reverence the Son of God? Do you reverence his person? Do you observe his ordinances? Do you respect his authority? Do you receive and practice his instructions? Do you obey his precepts? Do you accept his great salvation? Do you imitate his example? Do you reverence the Father who sent him? If not, where

is your reverence for the Son of God? You, who disobey the commands of God, where is your reverence? You, who indulge in practices, which you know are forbidden; where is your reverence? You, who are supremely devoted to the world, seeking its riches, pleasures, and honors; where is your reverence? If Christ had tasted death, to make you rich and honorable in the world, then, you might have shown him reverence, in this way. But since he suffered the death of the cross, to wean you from the world, and lead you to seek superior and more substantial good, where is your reverence? You, who live in impenitence and unbelief, where is your reverence? You, who are halting between two opinions, doubting whether it is best to serve Christ, or to serve the world and your own lusts; where is your reverence? You must have already conceded, that it was an infinitely reasonable expectation, that mankind should reverence the son of God. Are you not witnesses against yourselves, then, that reverence for him might be reasonably expected, and must be reasonably required of you? Are you not witnesses against yourselves, that, if you do not reverence the son of God, God may be justly displeased with you, and miserably destroy you? Does it not, then, become you to enquire, most seriously, what is the truth, in regard to this matter; and if, hitherto, you have not suitably regarded the Son of God; that you be careful to treat him with disrespect no longer? Should it appear, eventually, that those, concerning whom such reasonable expectations have been formed, should, on seeing the Son, take him and kill him, and cast him out of the vineyard; and should it be inquired of you, What, therefore, shall the Lord of the vineyard do; would not your own answer be, He shall miserably destroy those wicked men? Take heed, then, lest that come upon you, which is written, "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked servant."

S. A.

FOR THE EVANGELIST.

CONFIDENCE IN GOD.

In the days of King Saul, the Philistines invaded Israel with a very powerful army. The invaded kingdom was at this time weak. A new system of government had just been adopted; and the people were poorly furnished with weapons of defence. Having themselves no manufactory of the implements of war, they were dependent upon the Philistines, who, aware of the advantage, withheld from them the means of resistance. Indeed, so weak and broken was their condition, at the time of the invasion, that Saul could not bring into the field more than about six hundred men; and among these there were only two swords, one of which belonged to himself, and the other to Jonathan his son.

The army which came against Israel, when in this broken and weak state, consisted of "thirty thousand chariots, and six thousand horsemen, and people as the sand on the sea shore for multitude." These were all veteran troops, well armed, and led by valiant commanders, who were giants in size, strength and prowess.

The men of Israel, except the six hundred who followed Saul, had fled panick struck on the approach of the Philistine's army. Some had "hid themselves in caves and in thickets and in rocks, and in high places, and in pits"—and some had gone over to the protection of the enemy—leaving their King, with his handful of men, either to defend himself against such a host of warlike adventurers, or fall into their hands. In this forlorn condition was the King of Israel, with only a few trembling followers, unprepared for battle, surrounded by a formidable army, who were ready and eager for the attack, when the young Prince conceived the noble design of attempting the deliverance of his people.

Jonathan the son of King Saul was a pious Prince. While his father was a wicked man, he was devoted to the interests of the church and the service of the Lord. He considered Israel as the chosen people of God. He knew that the church was embodied in that nation, and that the honor of God was pledged for her protection.—He moreover knew that the Philistines were the enemies of Israel, on account of their holy character as God's peculiar people ; and also of Israel's God, who had brought their tribes out of Egypt, established them in Canaan, and hitherto protected and prospered them. As the enemies of Jehovah and the church, Jonathan therefore hated them, and desired their overthrow. Seeing the church surrounded by so many inveterate foes, he became very anxious for her safety. Not that he despaired of divine interposition in behalf of Israel, for he knew that God would protect "the apple of his eye." He was confident that the Lord was able, without human aid, to put to flight the armies of the aliens : but he knew also that in such cases God usually wrought by means ; that he often used the aid of his friends among the children of men, feeble, indeed, of themselves, but mighty through God to the accomplishment of great designs.

While Saul and the people who followed him, were trembling with fear, expecting soon to be overwhelmed by a numerous, powerful and exasperated enemy—Jonathan, with high confidence in the God of Israel, remained undismayed amidst all these appalling circumstances. He felt an assurance that God would, in due time, appear for the deliverance of the church from the impious invasion of her enemies ; and all he desired, was to be the humble instrument in God's hands of effecting such a glorious deliverance.

On a certain day, while this godly youth was viewing from an eminence the enemies of his country and his God, considering their numbers, their strength, and their determined enmity to Jehovah and his people ; he could not avoid reflecting upon the condition of that feeble unarmed, disheartened band, that remained with his father to oppose them ; and the evident want of confidence in God and zeal for his cause, which was manifest in the whole nation of Israel. The anticipation of the utter extermination of the church, which seemed to be threatened by such a state of things, excited, in his pious heart, an anxious desire to be the instrument of effecting her deliverance. Israel, the nation with whom God's honor dwelt and with whose prosperity his own interest, (as heir to the crown) was identified, must be delivered from the dangers which threatened their destruction ; and the name of the true God, whom he loved with all his heart, must be redeemed from the reproach, which seemed ready to be cast upon it. Remembering

therefore, what God had wrought for his people in former seasons of danger and distress, knowing that the power of God, when heretofore exerted in their behalf, was wholly irresistible—being aware too, that while the excellency of the power was wholly of God, human means were necessary in order to secure the divine co-operation—and feeling a consciousness that he, as an individual, had a duty to perform, he felt an impulse suggesting to him, that something must be done, and that speedily, for the deliverance of his people. Under this impulse, he addressed his armour bearer with the following remarkable words. “Come and let us go over to the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that the Lord will work for us; for there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few.” The event shows, that the impulse under which this proposal was made was from heaven, and that his confidence in God was well founded.

Jonathan’s armour bearer proved to be a man of like spirit with himself. The proposal was accepted, and a token agreed upon, as a signal of God’s favor, which, if God would be pleased to grant, they would proceed with their enterprize. “We will pass over to these men,” said Jonathan, “and we will discover ourselves unto them. If they say unto us—‘Tarry until we come unto you,’ then we will stand still in our place, and will not go up unto them. But if they say thus—‘Come up unto us,’ then we will go up; for the Lord hath delivered them into our hands, and this shall be a sign unto us.” To this his armour bearer assented, and thus they referred their enterprize to the Lord of hosts for approbation and direction.

Having done this, no time was to be lost. Jonathan and his armour bearer immediately discovered themselves to the army of the Philistines. These enemies of Israel and of Israel’s God, exulting in a presumptive confidence of their own strength, called out to these humble servants of God and gave them a challenge, to come up unto them. The enterprize which these two men had just referred to the Lord of hosts for approbation, had now, by him, been recognized; and the wished for signal granted. The signal was eagerly accepted. Though the ascent to the Philistines camp was steep, difficult, and dangerous, yet Jonathan and his armour bearer, strong in the Lord, and confident of success through his all powerful aid, climbed the steep ascent, and, with godly fear, and trembling joy, gained the summit of the precipice. They now found themselves amidst the enemies of their country and their God. It was indeed a fearful odds,—two against an innumerable host: but the Lord was with them, and they had nothing to fear. They began their work and the enemy fell before them. “There is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few.” This truth now became strikingly evident; for while God strengthened the hands of his faithful servants for the combat, he filled the hearts of their enemies with terror. “and there was a trembling in the host, in the field, and among the people; the garrison and the spoilers they also trembled; and the earth also quaked: so it was a very great trembling.” The Lord also, in whose hands are the hearts of all men, turned every man’s sword in the army of the Philistines, against his fellow—“and behold the multitude melted away, and they went on beating down one another.” With a suddenness resembling an electric shock, was the effect of this enterprize felt throughout the nation of Israel. Saul and his desponding troops heard the noise of the

routed army—the watchmen beheld their flight—the courage of Saul and his troops was revived, and *they* hastened to the combat. The Hebrews in the camp of the Philistines, who, through treacherous fear had joined the enemies of their country, now deserted their standard, and “turned to be with the Israelites that were with Saul and Jonathan.” Vast numbers of others, who had concealed themselves to escape danger, having their courage revived by the fast spreading news of the begun deliverance, came immediately up to the help of the Lord against the mighty ; so that in a very few hours an overwhelming force of Israelites was collected, and precipitating themselves upon the fleeing enemy, carried death and slaughter into every part of their army. The event was not only sudden but decisive. It resulted in the entire discomfiture of that vast and terrible army which came against Israel, and in strengthening the hands and encouraging the hearts of God’s people to resist future invasions.

Thus a good design, conceived in the breast of a single individual in the morning, and its executions commenced, in reliance upon divine aid, even under circumstances apparently the most unfavorable, resulted, before the setting of the sun, in an achievement most glorious in relation to the interests of religion ; the effects of which were felt by every individual in two powerful nations.—“Behold how great a matter a little fire kindleth.”

The history of this event, and the attendant circumstances as they have now been related, will furnish us with several important lessons of instruction.

1. The children of God have no reason for despondency, however appalling the dangers may seem, which threaten the Church. The true Israel of God can always obtain help from him, “who worketh and none can hinder.” God is ever in the midst of his people ready and willing to help them. He may sometimes suffer them to be surrounded by dangers of the most formidable nature and the most portentous aspect, in order to excite them to duty, or to evince his power and faithfulness in their deliverance. But God ever will protect the church ; for he has chosen her for his “spouse ;” he has “graven her upon the palms of his hands :” and he will ever cherish her “as the apple of his eye.” Yet “he will be enquired of by the house of Israel to do these things for them :” and when they forget their dependence on him he will often, in mercy, multiply their dangers, and diminish their earthly supports, till they are driven to him for help, as their last and only resort. But they never will, with confidence apply to him, without finding him a God at hand—ready and able to deliver them. Such, in all these particulars, was the case, in the instance which we have been considering : and such is often the case at the present day. Of the power and dominion of God there is no end. He is the same yesterday, to day, and forever. How unreasonable, then, and even impious is it, for the professed people of God to indulge despondency in seasons of danger ! Instead of desponding they ought to look to him for help, and go forward in their duty, relying with the fullest confidence on his faithfulness and ability to succor them. But for our further encouragement in going forward in duty, this history which we have been considering, will furnish us with another lesson of instruction, viz.

2. When God aids the labors of his people in his service, they will

find no opposition sufficient to hinder this work. By this I do not mean that they will meet with no opposition. They ought indeed to expect that Satan will oppose them with all his forces. The powers of darkness will assuredly set themselves in array against them. The Adversary will excite the enemies of religion to assume a threatening posture—to bid them defiance—and to challenge them to come on to the combat. “Come up unto us,” said the Philistines to Jonathan “and we will show you a thing.” Such a challenge, however, ought not to be considered, by those who commence such an enterprize, as a matter of discouragement: but rather, as Jonathan and his armour bearer considered it, a token of success. It is the peculiar season for God to work, when men make void his law. And the servants of God have always reason to conclude, that the Lord is with them, when they are derided and threatened by the enemies of religion. When Nehemiah and Ezra rebuilt the temple of Jerusalem, they would have wanted one evidence, that the Lord was their helper, had not Satan opposed their work. And that opposition, conducted by Sanballat and Tobiah, so far from hindering or retarding their work, served rather to hasten its progress. For such was the increased diligence of the workmen, and such the aid they received from heaven, that they accomplished more in the same term of time, than even Solomon did, with none to oppose him. No possible opposition can hinder the work of God’s servants, when he aids their labours. Who indeed can resist the power of Omnipotence? He has only to speak and it is done—to command and it stands fast. In the strength of the Lord the weakest saint becomes invincible. When God is with his children, one can chase a thousand, and two can put ten thousand to flight. In the case of Jonathan and his armour bearer, thirty thousand chariots, six thousand horsemen, and people without number, fled dismayed, and melted away before two individuals, who had the Lord for their helper. Christian reader, are you not almost persuaded to put your trust in the Lord, and go forward? Why should you hesitate? Are you waiting for others to join you in the work? If so, the history of Jonathan’s enterprize will afford you another important lesson of instruction, which, it is hoped will remove that hindrance. And that is,

3. A very small number who have confidence in God, may safely commence their labor in his service, without waiting for additional human aid. Divine assistance may always be obtained in a religious enterprize, which God shall approve, if no more than *two* are agreed in asking it; and where such assistance is obtained, there is no necessity of waiting for human aid; but we may commence the enterprize immediately. It was upon this principle, that Jonathan and his armour bearer acted in the instance before us. And in this instance the circumstances were as forbidding, as any that could well be conceived. What indeed could be more so? The army of the Philistines was immense. The army of Saul consisted of only six hundred men, and those both unarmed and disheartened. No assistance therefore could be expected from them in the commencement of the work. If the enterprize were to go on, those *two* must go forward in it alone. What in such a case should be done? Would not a prudent man consider it rashness to go forward? But the cause, in which they were engaged, was the cause of God: and Jonathan and his associate, unappalled by the appearance of danger, put themselves under the divine

protection—went forward to their work, without waiting for the aid of their fellow soldiers : and the event showed, that the resolution they adopted was the dictate, both of sound wisdom and prudence. It is too general an opinion, among those who profess to be the children of God, that there can be no religious reformation, unless the whole church, to which they belong, are ready to enter unitedly upon their appropriate work. In consequence of such an opinion they often wait for each other to get ready. If any individuals begin to feel the importance of doing something for the interests of religion and the salvation of souls ; yet, if they discover in their brethren, a tardiness in coming with them into the work, they soon conclude, that nothing can be effected ; and, giving up all exertions, they sink down again *themselves* into sloth and stupidity. How often is this distressing fact verified by experience. But Jonathan and his Armour bearer acted not upon a principle like this. Had they concluded that nothing could be done, till all Israel should come to their aid, or even till the courage of Saul's little army should be revived ; the Philistines would doubtless have overrun the whole country, and that little army, who protected their King, would have been utterly destroyed. But these servants of God were aware, that they had a duty to perform : and that duty they must discharge themselves, whether others came to their aid or not. They therefore went on with their appropriate work, without stopping to confer with flesh and blood, and their success was complete and glorious. And if we will examine the history of religious revivals, we shall find that they very often commence through the apparent influence of the faithful labors of one or two individuals. On viewing the desolations around them their eyes affect their hearts—they begin to feel for the afflictions of Zion—they see their duty and perform it, without waiting for others to do theirs—the divine blessing follows, and their exertions are crowned with glorious success. But another instructive lesson which we derive from this story of Jonathan and his associate, is,

4. The successful enterprising exertions of one, is the most sure method of engaging the exertions of others. The enterprize which we have been relating, originated in the breast of a single individual. He suggested it to an intimate associate who felt the same interest in the welfare of Israel, and he at once was filled with ardour for the same enterprize. Without hesitation they began their work, and such was the astonishing success—so rapidly did the news of it spread through the country—and such was its influence upon the timid, the disheartened, and the treacherous, that, in a few hours, it brought to the aid of these servants of God, the whole force of the nation of Israel.

In a manner similar to this, do revivals of religion often commence and go forward. The work is begun by the active zeal of one or two individuals. At once the disheartened, who had felt that nothing could be done with effect, are encouraged ; the timid, who had hidden themselves both from the friends and enemies of Zion, are emboldened to take their stand among the servants of God ; the treacherous backslider, who had openly gone over to the world and its iniquities, is alarmed at his defection, and reclaimed to his duty ; and behold, in a very short time, the whole church, united in one formidable phalanx under the great Captain of salvation, are moving forward “ from conquering

and to conquer." Their success is complete—their triumphs are glorious—distant churches hear the glad tidings and rejoice—and all heaven is filled with new anthems of rapturous praise to God.

And now, christian readers, are you not desirous of seeing all these things occur among you? Who then is ready to make the beginning? Where is the *Jonathan and his Armour bearer*, who are willing to commence the glorious enterprize? Do you as an individual feel that something must be done; but fear that you can find none to engage with you in the work? Go to your most intimate christian brother—suggest your feelings to him—engage him as your associate in the enterprize: and when you have committed your cause to God, go forward, and make a beginning—"It may be, that the Lord will work for you: for there is no restraint to the Lord to save by many or by few."

C. Y.

FOR THE EVANGELIST.

ON UNION IN RELIGIOUS WORSHIP.

Many people, and even some professing christians, and I had almost said some ministers, seem to imagine, that little more is necessary to introduce the full glory of the Millennium, than for christians of different denomination to lay aside all doctrines, concerning which different views are entertained, and worship together in the same congregation, and unite in the same communion. There are others, however, who think differently, and would be very unwilling to relinquish the great doctrines of the gospel, for the sake of *any union* whatever, which requires such relinquishment. In their opinion, unanimity both in views and feelings, in respect to the fundamental doctrines of Scripture, may be expected to exist among the people of God, and especially among the watchmen of Zion, in the days of the Millennium. This they understand to be the meaning of the prophet, when he says, "Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing; for they shall see eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion." And if they are correct in this, it is obvious that no attempt at union, in religious worship, or at the table of Christ, with those denominations, who differ upon essential doctrines, can be calculated to promote that ultimate agreement among the people of God, which is contemplated in the scriptures, as one of the glories of the latter day. In favor of the correctness of this opinion the following considerations are submitted.

1. The human mind is so constituted, that the exercises of the heart will be very much characterized by the perceptions of the understanding. No man can contemplate two objects, in which he feels interested, the qualities of which are totally different, and do it with precisely the same feelings. The reason is obvious. It is merely the qualities of the object which excite his feelings. If then, these are different, the feelings excited by them will be different. And if two persons should contemplate the *same object*, and each ascribe to it *different qualities*, the case would be the same. Their feelings towards the object would be different; each having feelings correspon-

ding with the qualities, which he ascribed to it. How differently are men often affected by contemplating the character of their fellow men! For instance, with what different feelings do different individuals contemplate the character of the Rev. John Westley and the Rev. Jonathan Edwards! What different emotions are excited merely by announcing these different names! And yet the diversity of feeling in this case, is no greater than the difference of the estimation, in which the two characters are severally held. It is simply the different qualities attributed to these characters, which excite this difference of feeling. And the same thing is true, in regard to every branch of science, and to every principle of ethics. Men will be affected differently by them, as they differ in estimating their relative influence and importance. Nor are their impressions, in respect to the character of the Supreme Being, exempt from this general law of their nature. It is impossible for a person, who contemplates the Saviour as a finite Being, to be influenced by the same kind of feelings, with which those are, who contemplate him as an infinite Being. If, then, those who view the Saviour, as a mere creature, should unite in worship with those, who view him as possessing the attributes of independent Deity, they might, indeed, ascribe to him the same names; they might call him Jesus Christ, Lord, and Saviour; but, after all, they would have entirely distinct and different characters in view. And, so long as these different views should exist, it would be impossible that there should be union of affection among the different worshippers. Their assembling at the same time and place, for worship, and their using the same words, in their addresses at the throne of grace, would not produce the same feelings. As it respects real union of heart, there would be none, any farther than their views harmonized. The rest would be a species of mockery. So in respect to the attributes and government of God. If men differ in their sentiments, in respect to the attributes of Deity, and in respect to the principles, by which he governs the Universe, they cannot agree in their moral exercises, or be said to hold the same character in view, or to worship the same God. If, for instance, one person believes that Deity knows all things from eternity; and another believes that he does not; if the former believes that he has foreordained whatsoever comes to pass, and the latter does not; if the former believes that he has no new purpose, that he will overrule moral evil to his highest possible glory and the best good of the intelligent universe, and the latter does not; if the former believes in the doctrine of God's eternal election unto life, of all who have or will be redeemed from among men, and that their special awakening, renewal, justification, and sanctification by the spirit of the Lord, is in pursuance of this election, and the latter does not; if the former denies the efficacy of unregenerate works in conciliating the divine favor, and the latter believes and confides in their efficacy; if the former believes that God will keep by his power through faith unto salvation all whom his spirit renews in the temper of their minds, and the other does not; if the former believes that the justice of God will never be satisfied with any temporary punishment of the finally impenitent, but the latter believes that it will, and that all men will ultimately be saved; if these differences exist, or any part of them, we say it is impossible for those two persons to worship together, with any unison of feelings. The supreme Divinity, which the former worships, is

not the same character which the latter worships. The former would be shocked at the idea of worshipping the character, which the latter worships ; and the latter would as soon shrink from the worship of the former. Now, if these two persons should meet together to worship, and should use the same words, in their addresses to Deity, they would not be agreed ; they would mean different things ; they would worship different Deities ; and the moment either of them should descend to any explanations, on essential points, the delusion would vanish, and the individuals learn, that, after all, there had been no union between them. This has been too often verified by experiment to need any farther confirmation.

2. God does not contemplate a union in worship and communion, of denominations differing upon essential doctrines, until they are first enlightened and made to harmonize in their views. This is evident from the practice and instructions of the apostles. We never find the apostles making attempts to embrace persons in their worship and communion, who differed from them in essential doctrines. Modes and customs, not affecting the truth and simplicity of the gospel, they did not suffer to bar their communion, provided there was evidence of personal sanctification ; but they maintained the strictest watch against doctrinal errors, that would, if admitted, subvert the gospel of Christ, and introduce another gospel. The apostle Paul to the Romans 18. 17. speaks agreeably to his uniform practice, and, no doubt, to the practice of all the other apostles, " Now I beseech you, brethren, mark them which cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them." To the Galatians he says, 1. 8. " But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, let him be accursed." Now, is not that another gospel, which reveals the Saviour in another character than that, which the apostles preached ? And is not that another gospel, which ascribes different attributes to God, and sets forth entirely different principles upon which he governs his intelligent creatures ? If it is, then it is plain, that God did not contemplate in his instructions to his servants, that they should endeavor to effect an external union with those, who differed so essentially from them, in respect to gospel principles. Nor did the apostles so understand their Lord. And doubtless, the reason why this was not contemplated, was, because infinite wisdom saw, that the tendency of such a union would be detrimental to the church.

Moreover, God has taught us, in his word, by what means a real union, in worship and communion, will be eventually brought about in his church, during her triumphant state on earth. It will be done by an increase of light and knowledge. For *they shall see, eye to eye, when the Lord shall bring again Zion.* In reference to that period, Daniel says, *Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.* And Isaiah says, *Moreover, the light of the moon shall be as the light of the sun ; and the light of the sun shall be sevenfold, as the light of seven days, in the day that the Lord bindeth up the breach of his people, and healeth the stroke of their wound.* By these passages of scripture, we are taught how the watchmen will be able to lift up the voice, and with the voice together sing. They will see alike, on the subject of the divine attributes, and the leading doctrines of his word, so that their affections will be drawn forth towards the same object,

They will each be edified by the truth, and no illustration of an essential doctrine will divide the feelings of the watchmen, nor of their flocks ; but they will agree, and rejoice, and *sing together*. But, does the present method of attempting to unite, in the same worship and communion, different denominations, who are divided upon essential doctrines, tend to promote this predicted union ? If we examine, for a moment, the grounds, on which the different denominations entertain even the slightest hope of union, we shall see that it is not. One indispensable condition of such union, always expressly agreed on, or implied, is, that the particular doctrinal distinctions, which separate them, shall not be brought into view, to be illustrated and enforced, as important in the business of salvation, or in forming the christian character. And it is well known, that if this condition is not strictly regarded, no union can be perpetuated.

Another condition always implied in such cases is, that those who attempt thus to unite, confess, by their actions, at least, that *essential doctrines* are not so important as *non-essential practice*. For while these different denominations do not even pretend to believe, that their union is necessary to the salvation of either party, they still relinquish essential doctrines, for the sake of this union ; that is, they consent and agree, not to inculcate and defend those doctrines which, themselves being judges, constitute the basis of that faith, which *was once delivered to the saints*. These are the conditions, on which, every such union is maintained. The consequences of such a union are.

First, a violation of the command to *mark* and *avoid* those, who are separated from us in their belief in respect to the essential doctrines of the gospel. And

Secondly, It is a departure from apostolic example. There is no such coalition between the apostles, and those who preached another gospel, on record for our example. Their practice corresponded with their preaching. And with what astonishment should we read the account of an attempt, on the part of Peter, to unite in worship and communion with those, whom he describes, as “denying the Lord who bought them ;” and upon the ground, too, that there should be no mention made of the particular sentiments, in which they differed ! And with equal surprize should we read, that the apostle Paul, upon the same ground, consented to unite with the enemies of divine sovereignty, divine decrees, the doctrine of election, and the perseverance of the saints ! Surely, no person, who is at all acquainted with the writings of the apostles, can seriously believe, that they were ever liable to be drawn into any alliances of this kind.

A *third* consequence of such a union, is an obstruction to the progress of doctrinal knowledge in the scriptures, which tends directly to counteract the means which God has appointed to effect a *real union* among all true believers. The first impression, that such a union is calculated to make on the mind is, that doctrinal knowledge is unimportant ; and that it is “no matter what a man believes if he is only sincere.” When this sentiment is once adopted, and a union formed on the ground of it, elderly persons suspend their researches for doctrinal knowledge, their teacher is trammelled by the principles of the confederacy, and cannot preach upon essential doctrines, without giving offence and dissolving the union, and of course the youth grow up unenlightened in the principles of the gospel, and unable to distin-

guish between what is true and what is false. Persons in such a state become an easy prey to every species of heresy. And to this source more than to any other, may be traced the origin of those pestilential errors, which sweep over the land of our fathers, who came to these shores, and braved every danger and sustained every hardship, that they might enjoy unmolested, and their children uncontaminated, the pure doctrines of the cross of Christ. Nor is the effect greatly different, where the watchmen refrain from preaching the essential doctrines of the gospel, in a lucid and pungent manner, through fear of giving offence to their hearers.

Another consequence of such attempts at union, and of such defect in respect to declaring the whole counsel of God, is quietness in sin. They were the essential doctrines of the gospel, which were rendered effectual to the conversion of sinners, under the preaching of the apostles. These were the two edged sword by which sinners were pricked in the heart. And the history of the church will inform us, that they have been rendered more successful, in every age, than all other preaching. It is where the gospel is preached in all its truths, that are offensive to the carnal mind, that sinners are awakened, convicted and converted unto God. It is here, ninety nine times in a hundred, that revivals of religion are witnessed, and the loftiness of the impenitent heart bowed to the sceptre of the Prince of peace. But where the essential doctrines of the gospel are suppressed, and a time-serving policy adopted in preaching, there stupidity reigns, the world triumphs, and moral darkness gathers blackness, as months and years revolve. We should be convinced then, of the fact, that all attempts at conciliating the views and feelings of those, who differ from us in the essential doctrines of the gospel, and our endeavors for a union with them at the expense of those doctrines, are not calculated to promote gospel union, and of course have no tendency to advance the interests of Zion.

The causes, which have operated to promote attempts for a union between orthodox and heterodox churches, deserve some attention.

1. One cause, we apprehend is, that many have mistaken appearances for reality. This is doubtless the case with many of our younger brethren in the ministry, whose experience, by reason of their youth, has been necessarily small. It is also the case with many lay-brethren who, it must be confessed, are sometimes extremely liable to be captivated by the fair professions of those, who plead for a union; and from the idea of gathering strength by numbers, they have prevailed on their ministers to attempt a union, when the unbiassed judgment of their pastors would have been more correct. We judge thus, because we have observed, that those wonderful attempts at union, which have been so frequently celebrated, and circulated by weekly newspapers through the civilized world, and hailed as the auspices of a more happy era of the church, have generally originated with young men, who have recently commenced preaching, and who, being transiently employed in the places, where these unions are formed, have seldom staid long enough to be able to form a correct judgment of the fruits of their labors. And we have known repeated instances, in which ministers have been prevailed on, by members of their churches, to attempt such union, until experience has taught them a wiser lesson.

2. Another cause of these attempts to unite persons in worship and communion, who are separated by different gospels, is the union of

different denominations, in giving circulation to the holy scriptures. Many do not see why, if different denominations unite in Bible Societies, and make their mutual speeches, on their public anniversaries, they may not unite in worship and communion at home. But, is it not a fact, that every man, whether a saint or sinner, a christian or a Turk, is admitted to membership in those societies, and is permitted to become instrumental in circulating the scriptures, without note or comment? This is the fact, and justly so. This determines nothing in respect to personal faith or character, nor is it designed to become a criterion of orthodoxy or of sanctification. And if membership in Bible Societies is admitted as a plea for union, in christian worship and communion, then to be consistent, every infidel in the nation, who is a member of a Bible Society is entitled to christian fellowship and communion. The absurdity of such doctrine and practice cannot fail to be seen.

3. Whatever tends to produce a deficiency of doctrinal knowledge among professing christians, at this time, in our country, must be considered as affording indirect aid to the prevalence of sectarianism, and of course must cherish a disposition for this unnatural union. And among the causes of this evil, at the present day, it is apprehended an important one will be found, in the particular character of many of our religious Newspapers. Let it not be conceived, that we would undervalue their importance, in the civil and religious community. We indeed consider them one of the most valuable improvements of the present age. We would however, wish to see them more *evangelical*; more *decided* in behalf of the *faith once delivered to the saints*. The principal demand, in this country, for a considerable time past, has been for *news*. What is this church, this society, this missionary doing? Where are there revivals? How much has this or that denomination done, in the grand moral achievements of the age? The design of these religious papers has been to afford this intelligence, and gratify this laudable inquiry. This is well and praiseworthy in publishers and in readers. But has not this *satisfied* all parties? Have they not stopped at reading, and declined thinking and investigating? Indeed have we not reason to fear, that the mere passing occurrences of the day have diverted the attention of the religious community from what is written in the lively oracles of God? Are not the rising generation coming forward to sustain a part in Zion's cause, if indeed they ever sustain any such part, upon the strength of mere news paper reading, and with the belief, too, that they are sufficiently indoctrinated? And what feeble resistance may be expected, from persons thus instructed against the sophistry and wiles of sectarianism!

4. May we not pertinently inquire, whether the want of apostolick zeal and faithfulness, on the part of many of the watchmen of Zion, is not a cause, why the importance of doctrinal knowledge is depreciating in the estimation of the religious community, and why such conformity to heterodox sentiments and practices is gaining ground? The doctrines of the cross were not promulgated, originally, without opposition; and they have never since been preached fully and faithfully without it; and it is totally unreasonable to expect, that they ever will be inculcated and enforced upon the consciences of men, without opposition so long as the "carnal mind is enmity against God, not subject to his law neither indeed can be." Every minister, then, may expect,

when he takes the charge of a particular church and people, that, if he is faithful and preaches as did the prophets, the Saviour and his apostles, he will meet with opposition, and especially from such as are enemies to the distinguishing doctrines of grace. Thus circumstanced, he has a strong temptation to relax in his preaching upon doctrines, that are offensive to the natural man, and either to suppress them altogether, or to discuss them in so loose a manner and so seldom, as not to awaken the suspicions and resentment of the determined enemies of the cross of Christ. And to avoid the clamours and strifes of sectaries he may compound with them, and endeavor to satisfy himself with the argument, that he will then be in a better situation to instruct them and win them over to the truth, than he would be to stand aloof, although he is under no particular obligation to instruct them, and might know, that similar experiments have, in almost every instance, resulted in giving the advantage to heterodoxy. And are there not many cases of this description, in our country? Many churches and societies sitting under the ministrations of such watchmen, who but seldom, if ever, hear more than a part of the gospel; and that too, a part, which nearly every denomination will approve, and which even an infidel would not condemn? These, we apprehend, are some of the causes of the decline of doctrinal knowledge, and of the increase of heterodoxy in our land; and however much we may felicitate ourselves upon the tidings we receive from the East and the West, the North and the South, (and they are glad tidings to every pious heart;) how much-soever we may contemplate ourselves, as rapidly approaching that union in the gospel, which will constitute one characteristic of Millennial day, a very few years must awaken us to the reality, that before this union will take place, a great revolution must be effected in our minds, and in our practice, in respect to doctrinal knowledge. And until this is realized, we may expect that errors, delusions and sectarianism will increase and abound. It is highly important, then, that the attention of the whole religious community should be alive to this subject. They must feel the deficiency, determine through divine assistance to effect a reformation, act in concert, and labour abundantly.

1. Churches must feel the importance of employing and supporting those ministers, who will preach the whole counsel of God, and who, while they manifest a christian concern for all souls, and are willing to spend and be spent to bring them to the knowledge of the truth, yet will never compound with the adversaries of the cross.

2. Editors of religious News papers should not decline publishing pieces written in defence of the distinguishing doctrines of grace; nor should they give a gloss and circulation to the doings of heterodox associations, which would tend to give them influence, although those particular acts were well, in themselves considered. No evil is so dangerous as when obscured with semblances of truth and sincerity.

3. Private christians ought to feel more the importance of doctrinal knowledge, and to apply themselves to the study of the scriptures, and other helps, on which they may depend for instruction.

4. Parents should be faithful and diligent in affording doctrinal instruction to their children and domestics. Youth is the season of life, when the human mind is most susceptible of lasting impressions. It should, in that period, be stored with the unalterable truths of God's

word, which will prove a strong defence against future apostacy, and by the grace of God, will bring the soul home to endless glory.

N. N.

FOR THE EVANGELIST.

ON A FALSE GOSPEL.

Is there not sometimes proclaimed a gospel, which gives a mistaken view of the character of God?

There may be much said of God, his name may cumber every sentence, and be repeated with a soft and well-bred whisper. And a careless hearer may suppose himself listening to a strain of piety, and may be charmed with the changes rung upon the adorable names, by which the Deity has revealed himself, and still, a more careful hearer may perceive that the God proclaimed is only half divine.

There is sometimes an extolling of all the softer, milder, lovelier attributes, as they have been presumptuously called, while his holiness, his justice, his truth,—all in him that can go to make a sinner afraid, or beget repentance, is industriously concealed. His pity to our world, his patience, his endurance, his long suffering, his readiness to forgive, and his total aversion to destroy,—all those features of the Godhead that can soothe alarm, are promptly and boldly developed, as if here was all of God, that he himself loves, or man is required to adore, while there is an industrious concealment of all the other attributes, as one would hide the scars and excrescences, that have fortuitously covered more than half his visage.

We sometimes have presented us a picture of marring attributes, mercy triumphs over justice, and grace drives truth and righteousness from the field of conflict. God has been exhibited as hating the very properties of his own nature, and contriving to defeat his own decrees. He gave his law, without making any provision for pardon, and passed sentence upon the sinner when he had broken it, but he has repented of the sternness, and integrity and purity, that dictated that law, and uttered that sentence, and has resolved, that, come what will, the sinner shall not suffer. He built a place of torment, and partitioned it from heaven by a bottomless gulf, but he hates the pit he dug, has bridged the gulf, and will put out the fires, and cause the worm to die.

To complete the absurdity, the Son of God has come to take the part of sinners, and snatch them from the teeth of a devouring justice. He saw that the execution of the law would ruin the credit of the court that gave sentence, and has come to defeat its execution. What was stern and unbending, and cruel in the Father, has been softened down in the Son. He lays his hand upon the head of the rebel, and wipes away his tears, and entreats him to forgive a father's unbending severity.

Thus God has been so exhibited as to involve heaven in a quarrel, and place the very persons of the Godhead at issue on the question, whether the law is good, or shall be repealed, and the offender forgiven.

I know that men who are resolved to go on in sin, who have long been offended at the purity and extent of the law, and would have no concern if all the rights of the Godhead were trampled upon, find it very convenient to have the character of God thus brought down to their taste and temper. He becomes, in the report of such a gospel, altogether such an one as themselves. He can give out his word and then break it; can make a law, and when men have fallen under its curse, repeal it; can join the rebel in hating his own attributes; can issue an edict and then a counter edict by which the first is neutralized. So Ahasuerus could sign a decree to destroy his Jewish subjects, and then enact another directing them to arm themselves for their own defence, and thus his decree comes to the ground. But can it be believed that God will bear all this? Will he suffer his character to be tampered with, and finally thus frittered down to the taste and the convenience of a polished, and proud, and worldly, and time serving generation?

Why not exhibit God in his own proper character, holy, just, and true, as well as good? Let there be a perfect balance among his attributes; let him be neither too merciful to be just, nor too pitiful to be holy, nor too gracious to be true; let him have no darling attribute, nor make any clashing decrees, nor send his Son to soothe, and flatter, and defend the rebel, while yet in all his stubbornness and his pride; or let not that be called the gospel, which thus creates confusion in the counsels of the Godhead. If men cannot be easy, under the *true gospel*, let them have *none*. Let the Bible be considered a dream, and be burned by the hangman; let the temple of God be shut; and let there be proclaimed, boldly and openly, an infidelity, that shall render the whole of this alienated world forever from the authority, and the rule, and the inspiration of an intrusive and disgusting Divinity. Why employ men to undo us, by persuading us, that God is what he is not? A spurious gospel is the deadliest pestilence that ever broke loose from hell. The character of God will not be found, at last, to have shaped itself to the wishes and the hopes of a disloyal world. It will be, when we come to deal with God in the judgment, what it always was. The attributes that may now be covered over, or disproved, or neutralized, will all be there seen to cluster and harmonize in the burning glories of the Godhead, on the day of retribution. We shall then have to deal with a God, as holy, and just, and true, as the law would make him; and still as merciful, and gracious, and long-suffering, as the gospel would make him. No attribute will be worn away by the revolution of years; nor be changed to meet the exigencies of a betrayed and miserable world.

But, ah! this frittered, mangled gospel, when the cheat shall have been detected; when its trumpeters shall have displayed the rottenness of their character; and those, who have slept under its soothing lullaby, shall have been waked by the archangel's tempest;—how will it be viewed as the blast of the Sicilian Siroce. Men will remember such a gospel as they recollect the plague, that sent its poisonous exhalations into their streets, their houses, and their bed chambers; as the tempest that washed them, and all that was theirs, upon the reefs of death. It deceived, abused, and betrayed the very beings, it pretended to bless. It exhibited, under the adorable names of God, an idol of human invention, and concealed, behind its drapery, a Jehovah,

holy, just, and true ; jealous of his honor, and sworn, by all in him that is holy, to one day show himself, clothed in all his attributes, and prepared to vindicate his insulted honors.

C. A. D.

FROM THE HOPKINSIAN MAGAZINE.

The Divine Decrees afford no excuse for the wicked conduct of mankind.

It is a remarkable fact, that mankind are ever ready to excuse themselves for their wicked conduct. For this purpose, they resort to several pleas and subterfuges. Though they naturally hate the doctrines and duties of the Bible ; yet they are very willing to avail themselves of one or other of these doctrines and duties, to justify them in errors, both of faith and practice. When they are exhorted to repent and embrace the gospel, for instance, they will say they are unable, because of the Divine purposes. When the Divine purposes are clearly stated and vindicated, they will quarrel and reject them ; because, they say, the Divine purposes are inconsistent with their own free agency and accountability. When the free agency and accountability of mankind are clearly exhibited ; and it is plainly shown, that they are able, and under moral obligation to believe the doctrines and perform the duties of the gospel ; again they are angry, and say, This is entirely inconsistent with the purposes of God. Thus they alternately admit and reject the doctrines of the Bible, as they find convenient, to promote their own sinful conduct. As the doctrine of Divine Decrees is, perhaps, as often wrested for this purpose as any other, I shall make it the object of the following essay, to prove, that the decrees of God afford no excuse for the wicked conduct of mankind. In pursuing the subject, I shall endeavor to show,

I. That God has decreed the wicked conduct of mankind, and

II. That his decrees afford them no excuse.

I. I am to show, that God has decreed the wicked conduct of mankind. And,

1. God could not have been *indifferent* respecting the wicked conduct of mankind. To say that God was *indifferent* respecting the wicked conduct of mankind, is the same as to say that *He did not care* whether their wicked conduct took place or not. But this is highly to impeach the character of God. Are holiness and sin a matter of *indifference* ? Is it not derogatory to the character of God, to say, *He did not care* whether his creatures were *holy* or *sinful* ? God cannot be indifferent respecting *any* action of any of his creatures. We will take, for example, a single instance. How could God have been *indifferent* respecting the important events of Christ's crucifixion ? Did not God *care* whether Christ was crucified or not ? Was it no concern of his, whether the Divine Redeemer made an atonement for the remission of sins or not ? It is presumed, that no one will entertain such a reproachful idea of the great and eternal Jehovah. It is generally admitted, that Christ was sent into the world to die, the just for the unjust. He says himself, "For this cause came I unto this hour." But if God was not indifferent respecting Christ's death ;

then he could not have been indifferent respecting the *means* and *manner* of his death. The former must inevitably involve the latter. Hence, God could not have been *indifferent* respecting the wicked conduct of the Jews, in betraying and crucifying the Lord of glory. But if God was not indifferent respecting the wicked conduct of the Jews, in the crucifixion of Christ; then he could not have been indifferent respecting any part of that vast chain of events, which, from the creation of the world, tended to prepare the way, and introduce the important scenes of Christ's sufferings. And if God was not indifferent respecting these events, or actions of his creatures; no reason can be given, why he should be indifferent respecting any action or event which takes place in this lower world. It may be received, then, as a settled point, that God can never have been *indifferent* respecting the wicked conduct of mankind. This leads me a step further, to observe,

2. That God must have *decreed*, either that the wicked conduct of mankind should take place, or that it should not. This conclusion is inevitable. For, if any being is not *indifferent* respecting an object, he must necessarily have some *choice* respecting that object. If I was not absolutely *indifferent*, whether I should write this essay or not; then, certainly, I must have *chosen* either to write, or not to write. So of every being in the universe. But the decrees of God are what he *chooses* on the whole. If he *chooses* on the whole, that any thing should exist; that *choice* is his *decree*. Hence, it is also absolutely certain, that God must have decreed, either that the wicked conduct of mankind should take place, or that it should not. He must have decreed, either that Judas should betray Christ, or that he should not; either that Pilate should condemn him, or that he should not; either that the Jews should put him to death "by wicked hands," or that they should not. So of all the wicked conduct, which has ever existed in this fallen world, God must certainly have decreed, either that it should exist, or that it should not. But,

3. It is evident, from fact, that God never decreed, that the wicked conduct of mankind *should not exist*. Wickedness has been practised by all mankind, in every age of the world, from the apostacy of Adam to the present time. God himself has declared, that "the wickedness of man is great in the earth, and that every imagination of the thoughts of his heart is only evil continually." If, then, God had decreed that evil *should not exist*, the wickedness of mankind must exist in *opposition to his decrees*. That is, it must exist in spite of all that God could do to prevent it. For to say, that God is not *disposed* to accomplish his purposes, is a contradiction. To suppose, then, God chose, on the whole, to prevent the existence of evil, reduces us to the only alternative of supposing that he is *unable* to prevent its existence. That evil does exist, and has existed from the days of Adam, cannot be denied. But is God *unable* to do what he chooses? God is *almighty*. It is absolutely certain, then, that if he chose, on the whole, to prevent the existence of evil, it would never have had existence. There is no other conclusion possible. God has not decreed, that the wicked conduct of mankind should not exist.

If, then, God could not have been *indifferent* respecting the wicked conduct of mankind; and, hence, must have decreed, either that it should take place, or that it should not; but never decreed that their

wicked conduct should not take place ; it appears, to a moral demonstration, that He has *decreed* their wicked conduct. We may observe,

4. That the truth of this sentiment is established from the abundant testimony of Scripture. When Peter preached to the Jews, on the day of Pentecost, he said unto them, concerning Christ, "*Him, being delivered by the determinate counsel and fore-knowledge of God, ye have taken, and by wicked hands, have crucified and slain.*" Again it is written, "*For of a truth against thy holy child Jesus, whom thou hast anointed, both Herod and Pontius Pilate, with the Gentiles and people of Israel, were gathered together, for to do whatsoever thy hand and thy counsel determined before to be done.*" The apostles, also, declared concerning the death of Christ and his murderers, "*For they that dwell at Jerusalem, and their rulers, because they knew him not, nor yet the voice of the prophets which are read every Sabbath day, they have fulfilled them in condemning him.* And though they found no cause of death in him, yet desired they Pilate that he should be slain. And when they had fulfilled all that was written of him, they took him down from the tree, and laid him in a sepulchre." These passages of Scripture abundantly teach, that God had fore-ordained all the conduct of the Jews and rulers toward the Lord Jesus Christ, and caused them to accomplish his purposes ; though their motives were entirely sinful, and their conduct grossly criminal in his sight. We might, also, cite a multitude of passages to prove, that God decreed the conduct of Pharaoh ; of the wicked Canaanites ; of Jeroboam ; of Ahab ; of Judas Iscariot ; and that his eternal determinations extend to all the tribes of the earth, and include all the moral actions of all mankind. But sufficient, it is deemed, has been said, to establish this point ; and we hasten to show,

II. That the decrees of God afford no *excuse* for the wicked conduct of mankind. And,

1. Moral good, or moral evil, depends on the *nature* of the moral actions ; and not on any decree or determination. The distinction between virtue and vice is founded in the nature of things. This is agreeable to common sense. When we hear of a certain action performed by a certain individual, we never wait to enquire respecting any previous decree, or determination ; but immediately pronounce the action virtuous or vicious from its *own nature*. The nature of things can never be changed, by any decree or pre-determination, either in the natural or moral world. God has decreed, that light and darkness shall take place, in regular succession, by the means which he has appointed. But who will say, that this decree changes the nature of light or the nature of darkness ? So in the moral world. Holiness is holiness still, and sin is sin still,—notwithstanding the divine decree. It was decreed and foretold, that the Lord Jesus Christ should be perfect in holiness, during the whole course of his mediatorial work. But who will say, that the holiness of the Divine Redeemer was not holiness, or that his conduct was not virtuous ; because it was pre-ordained ? Who will pretend to say, that the labors of the Apostle Paul were not virtuous and praise-worthy ; because he was a *chosen vessel*, to bear the name of Christ to Gentile nations ? But if the conduct of good men is truly virtuous and praise-worthy in its own nature, notwithstanding the divine decree ; why may not the

conduct of wicked men be vicious and blame-worthy in its own nature, notwithstanding the Divine decree? Who will say, that the lying spirit, which was fore-ordained and sent into the mouths of all Ahab's prophets, *was not a lying spirit*, because of the Divine decree? Such an assertion would be perfectly absurd and ridiculous. The wicked conduct of mankind, then, is *evil in its own nature*; and its quality can never be destroyed by any decree or fore-ordination whatever. But whatever is morally evil, in its own nature, always implies guilt. And whatever implies guilt, renders it absolutely certain, that the guilty person has *no excuse* for his conduct. For no person can justly be considered and treated as *guilty*, who has any just or reasonable *excuse* for his moral conduct.

2. The decrees of God do not destroy the *free agency* of mankind. Free agency consists in *choosing*. This is all the free agency of which we are able to conceive. No one can desire to be any more free, than to act of choice. This is all the free agency there is, or can be, in any being whatever. It is all the free agency that God possesses. He acts voluntarily, and is, therefore, a free agent; and mankind act voluntarily; and are, therefore, free agents. We cannot conceive of any moral being, who does not act of choice. Now, in order for the decrees of God, to destroy the free agency of mankind, they must prevent their choosing. But this is contrary to fact. Who will say, that the Jews and Gentiles *did not choose* to do as they did, in crucifying the Lord of glory? Who will say, that Judas *did not choose* to betray Christ; or that Peter *did not choose* to deny him? Such an assertion would be contrary to common sense. Every one is conscious of choosing to do whatever he does do. But whenever any person acts of *choice*, it always supposes that he has power or ability to do differently. And this power to do differently, is not destroyed by any divine decree. Those, who act of choice, are certainly under no compulsion. *Choice* is the very *opposite* of compulsion. Judas was not *compelled* to betray his Lord; nor was Peter *compelled* to deny him. Hence, they both certainly had power to do differently. But still their conduct was *decreed* and *foretold*. It is a dictate of common sense, that mankind act freely in all their conduct. But when mankind *choose* to conduct wickedly, and consequently, are able to conduct otherwise; what excuse can they offer for their sinful conduct? What excuse could the Jews offer for their wicked conduct, in crucifying the Son of God; though it is expressly declared that they fulfilled the Divine purposes? It is a demonstrable fact, and often has been demonstrated, that God has fore-ordained whatsoever comes to pass: and it is a demonstrable fact, and often has been demonstrated, that mankind act freely in all their conduct; and consequently, have no excuse for any sinful action, but are altogether blame-worthy.

3. The holy and wise God *condemns* mankind for their wicked conduct. He threatens the transgressor with eternal destruction. He says, "Wo unto the wicked! it shall be ill with him; for the reward of his hands shall be given him." And God has actually punished thousands of incorrigible sinners for their wicked conduct. But if we say that the Divine decrees afford mankind an excuse for their wicked conduct; we impeach the Divine character. We virtually charge God with injustice and cruelty. "But, who art thou, O man, that repliest against God?" Who will rise up, and urge, that God

condemns and punishes the wicked, while yet they have a reasonable excuse for their conduct? This is the language of rebellion. It is bringing the highest charges against the Sovereign of the universe. We may add,

4. That mankind have frequently condemned themselves for their wicked conduct. Notwithstanding the Divine decrees, Pharaoh knew the Divine purposes respecting himself; for God told him, that he had, in very deed, raised him up to fit him for destruction. But the conscience of Pharaoh condemned him for his wickedness, and he was constrained to cry out, at different times, "*I have sinned; the LORD IS RIGHTEOUS; but I and my people are wicked.*" The consciences of Joseph's brethren smote them for their wicked conduct; though God had "*sent*" him into Egypt, "to preserve them a posterity in the earth, and to save much people alive." "They said one to another, We are verily *guilty* concerning our brother, in that we saw the anguish of his soul, when he besought us, and we would not hear." Judas knew the Divine purposes respecting himself; for his conduct was foretold ages before he was born. Our Lord, also, declared to his face, that he would betray him. But, after the commission of this horrible crime, Judas came and cast down the thirty pieces of silver in the temple, and said, "*I have sinned, in that I have betrayed the innocent blood.*" Peter had been informed of the Divine purposes, that he should surely deny his Lord. But when the deed was done, his conscience smote him, "*and he went out and wept bitterly.*" The Jews, also, were *pricked in their hearts*, at the sermon of Peter, on the day of Pentecost, though he told them plainly, that they had fulfilled the Divine decrees in crucifying the Son of God. Thus the consciences of mankind have condemned them for their wickedness in thousands of instances.

Since, then, moral good and evil do not depend on the Divine decrees, but on the *nature of moral actions*; since the decrees of God do not destroy the free agency of mankind; since the holy and wise God condemns them for their wicked conduct; and since mankind have so frequently condemned themselves, and justified the conduct of God; we may have the assurance, that the decrees of God afford not the least excuse for the least transgression.

This subject suggests a number of important inferences, which, by the leave of the Editor, will be submitted in a subsequent essay.

PHILO-HOPKINSIAN.

FROM THE BOSTON TELEGRAPH.

ON IMPRUDENT SPEAKING.

"The tongue is a fire, a world of iniquity, it sets on fire the course of nature, and is set on fire of hell."

The design of this paper is not to bring into notice what is commonly understood by *false speaking*, but a speaking of the supposed, or real faults or imperfections of absent persons, *especially in the presence of children*.—There are evils, which result from unnecessarily speak-

ing of the real, or supposed faults of absent persons, which are too seldom considered.

First, it is a *waste of precious time*.—Time is wasted, when it is needlessly spent: it is needlessly spent, when employed in needless occupations: And it is needlessly occupied, when we speak of the real or supposed failings of others, unless obvious good will be the result. In all other cases, it is a waste of time; therefore wrong. Dr. Young, speaking of the preciousness of time, says,

“Part with it as with money, sparingly; pay

“No moment, but in purchase of it's worth;

“And what its worth, ask death-beds; they can tell.”

2. There is danger of *exaggeration*.—It is rare, if ever, we speak of the failings of absent persons, out of pure friendship to *them* and to *truth*. In speaking of the faults of those for whom we do not entertain sentiments of entire friendship, we are very liable to *exaggerate* their faults. A person may even do this unconsciously. Through the depravity and deceitfulness of the heart, without meaning to do it, he may give it a coloring, which will amount to exaggeration, as it will convey an idea that the fault is greater than it really is.

3. There is danger of *misrepresentation*.—What is related may come through several hands; it may be too highly colored; it may come with designed, or undesigned additions; or some important part may be omitted: different words from the original may be used in the recital, which convey a different meaning; or the *same* words may be used in the recital, which convey a different meaning; *same* words may be used, and yet, in a different connexion, emphasis, or manner, convey a different idea from what was intended. Also, by the omission of some circumstance, or circumstances, which have an important bearing on the subject, a very different construction will be put upon the language and conduct in question. And we find it true in fact, by some means or other, that scarcely any report can go from one house to another, without some exaggerations or misrepresentations. Hence, the person spoken of is *injured*. He loses the respect to which he was entitled, and with it the influence among men, which otherwise he would have.

If *children* hear such unsavory conversation, they will imbibe strong ideas of the man's unworthiness of respect, and will be likely to treat him accordingly. And if he be capable of using a good influence for his own benefit, it is so far lost by your imprudent speaking. The young, having imbibed, will retain the sentiments you have unguardedly and ungraciously given them of the man, as long as they live. And still he may be a man worthy of the high respect of all.

4. It is injurious to those who relate, and to those to whom the relation is made.—It dissipates the mind of such as are accustomed to such traffic, by tossing it about on every foolish and slanderous report, and away from subjects of permanent utility. The mind familiarizes itself with faults and crimes; and, by imperceptible degrees, loses the salutary influence of moral principle. And if the person slandered, (if I may call it slander,) is capable of exercising a good influence over the young, that influence is lost on them, as they have received from your recital, or loose conversation, a contemptible idea of that man. They will carry to their graves such opinions of him as will effectually

ally prevent their profiting by the best efforts he is capable of making.—Those who are at all acquainted with the power of prejudice on the human mind, and especially on the minds of children, can easily believe the above positions.—Those prejudices, or preconceived opinions will be likely to grow with their growth and strengthen with their strength. And scarcely can a counter-acting influence be found, of sufficient power ever to eradicate those false impressions from their minds.—They will not be able to weigh in an even balance the foibles or the crimes of other men. They attend not to the various circumstances and probable coloring of the things, and make no allowances, which mature minds would probably make; but all with them is plain, established truth, however venial or trivial the supposed foible or crime may be.

If such is the general tendency of imprudent speaking on character, it must be *most* pernicious in relation to *ministers of the gospel*. A stigma may be fixed upon a minister, which will forever fortify the mind of a child against the truth he may preach, or good instructions he may occasionally give. Those early impressions are durable as inscriptions in marble, and will have a baleful influence through life. However trivial a failing may be, if spoken of by those whom they esteem, in a *serious* way, children will consider it a *crime*, and the minister unworthy of his office. If spoken of in a careless or ludicrous way, it will beget, in the young mind, *contempt*, which will not only prevent the reception of truth from that minister “with all readiness of mind,” but all his instructions will be heard, if heard at all, with a sort of contemptuous jeer, and they will treat him with scornful derision, wherever they may see him.

Further—Their unlogical minds will judge *all* ministers much alike. From the few of whom they have heard what they judge criminal and contemptible, they judge all other ministers, and can early learn to cast a sneer of contempt upon the whole order of the priesthood.

But the evil stops not here. They early learn to condemn the *office itself*. The personal treatment of ministers, and the estimation in which they are held, considered *in itself*, is comparatively of little consequence. But they *will* associate the *office* with the *persons* holding it. And if they condemn the office, it would be strange if they did not *religion*, which characterizes the office. Both would fall below veneration and serious regard. The almost vacant minds of children, who are all eye, and all ear, and who yet are intelligent, do, undoubtedly, take more notice, receive more ideas, and retain more of what they hear, than is generally imagined: and especially, if what they hear, is of the nature of narrative, or of a slanderous character, which but too well accords with the tone of their depraved natures. Besides, children generally believe what their *parents* say. It is all truth; they take it for granted; never call it in question, and never examine for evidence.

It follows, then, that *parents* especially, and all others, should be exceedingly cautious *how* they speak, and *what* they say, in the presence of children, concerning *any* person, but *most especially* concerning those, who minister in holy things. It is undoubtedly true, that many, who grow up “despisers of those that are good,” scoffers at religion, and at length become infidels, received their first unhallowed

impressions in the family circle, where the best should be made, and where the best are *easily* made.

If, then, you wish your children to be good *citizens* and good *christians*, be extremely cautious *how* and *what* you teach them,—*how* and *what* you say in their presence. Attend to the philosophy of the human mind. The young mind is easily susceptible of impressions. And when they are made, be they of whatever character, they are *indelibly* made. You are forming those young immortals for noble, or ignoble deeds—for places of honor, or infamy—for joy, or for sorrow. O! that the minds of parents—of *all*, to whom is committed the care of children, might be duly impressed with a sense of their high responsibility. They are accountable to *God* for what their children become. It depends on *them*, under God, whether they be honorable or base. “Train up a child in the way he *should* go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.”

PHILANTHROPOS.

FROM THE UTICA CHRISTIAN REPOSITORY.

NEW DENOMINATION.

I herewith send to you certain proposals for *establishing a new denomination of Christians*, which have been furnished me by my friend, WILLIAM INSTABILIS, that you, or some of your correspondents, may pass your judgment upon them, and approve or condemn, as may be deemed best for the interest of Religion. I would here premise, that my friend, as his name indicates, is a little given to change, and somewhat ambitious withal. He has rather a preference to lead than to be led; and I have no doubt, that if he could be established at the head of a new Denomination, it would gratify him exceedingly.

PLAN

FOR ESTABLISHING A NEW DENOMINATION OF CHRISTIANS, TO BE STYLED

THE DEIPNISTS.

I. The doctrines which the denomination shall embrace, may be either the Calvinistic or the Arminian, or rather there may be, if the plan should be very successful, two kinds of Deipnists, one of which shall hold the former scheme, and the other the latter.

II. The principal point from which they shall differ from any denomination now in existence, shall be in regard to the *mode* of administering the Lord's Supper, which it is intended shall, in all respects, be primitive.

III. The following rules concerning this ordinance shall be adopted:—1. It shall be administered, not at noon, nor in the afternoon, but in the evening. See Mat. 26, 20, and Acts 20, 7—11: 2. The place of assembling shall be in an upper chamber. See Luke 22, 12, and Acts 20, 8: 3. The communicants shall partake in a reclining

posture. John 13, 23—25 : 4. No female shall be admitted : 5. It shall be the duty of each communicant to take as much of the bread and of the wine as will make a full meal.

IV. It is not essential in which way those, who may wish to join this denomination, be baptized.

V. None shall be admitted to commune with this denomination, unless they will comply with our mode of observing the ordinance.

VI. No minister of another denomination shall be considered regularly ordained, until he shall partake of the supper with the Deipnists, and be re-ordained by them.

REASONS

IN FAVOR OF ESTABLISHING A DENOMINATION OF THE ABOVE TITLE AND PECULIARITIES.

“The object of this denomination is, to restore the mode of administering the ordinance of the Lord’s Supper to its primitive form. The church under popery greatly corrupted the ordinances, and it has been too much the practice of even the Protestants to follow their traditions, without a due examination of the scriptures, to ascertain whether they were so “in the beginning.” Baptism, it is true, has obtained considerable attention from different denominations; but ever since the Reformers rejected the doctrines of Transubstantiation and Consubstantiation, there has been but little controversy concerning the supper. But little regard is paid to the time or place of receiving it, nor to the quantity received; neither to the sex which partakes of it, nor to their posture when it is given them. Now it is conceived that this ordinance is as important as that of baptism, that the primitive mode of administering it is more clearly pointed out, and that of course men ought to be as particular in their mode of observing it. There are now two large and respectable denominations called Baptists; and if they could be justified in withdrawing from other denominations and keeping distinct from them, because they have, as they conceive, come nearer to the primitive mode of administering baptism, then it must be justifiable to do the same thing in regard to the Lord’s Supper.

“Now they contend that their mode of administering baptism is more agreeable to the primitive practice, because 1st, it conforms to it in respect to place. They find some instances in which it appears to have been administered in or near a quantity of water. Why, then, should we not celebrate the supper in the same kind of place that the Saviour did, and Paul did once, at least, to wit, in an upper chamber? They think that the bodies of those who received baptism were put under the water in the act of administering the ordinance to them. We know, for certainty, that the disciples leaned one upon another while they were receiving the Supper, and shall not this mode be imitated? The same denomination does not admit infants to baptism, because they think they do not find an express command, or a plain example; for the same reason we consider it improper to admit females to communion. They also immerse the whole body in water, because they conceive that this practice accords the nearest with the primitive signification of the word *baptise*. We

contend, that, as every person will admit, the word *supper* usually signifies a full meal. Why shall not, therefore, so much bread and wine be taken at the Lord's Supper as will satisfy the wants of nature?

"The title of DEIPNISTS, formed from the Greek word, *Deipnon*, which signifies a supper, is chosen by us, because it is to be contended, by this denomination, that they are the only persons who do, in reality, partake of the Lord's Supper. For this reason, it shall be considered the duty of this sect to exclude others from their communion. It is obviously more proper to exclude a person from the table because he does not attend to *that* ordinance in a proper manner, than because he has not attended to *another* one aright. With respect to denying the validity of the ordination of ministers who shall not have received the ordinance after our mode of administering it, the practice of two respectable denominations is sufficient to justify us. The Baptists re-ordain those who have not been immersed, and the Episcopalians, those who have not been consecrated by a diocesan bishop. If it should be started as a difficulty in the way of the above plan, that it is perhaps impossible to find any people who can claim to be a regular succession of Christians who have had the ordinance administered to them in this way from the time of the apostles, it may be replied, that if this should prove to be the fact, then it will, in a case of so great necessity, be proper for some devout man, who is suitable to be the head of a sect, to partake by himself of this ordinance in a solemn manner, and for others to receive it from him. The example of Wesley, in ordaining his bishops with his own hands, will justify this procedure; and perhaps that of the Baptist denomination will do the same; for it is very doubtful whether their mode of baptism, or their ordinations, have been handed down to them in a regular succession from the time of the apostles; even if it should be admitted that immersion was the primitive mode."

Thus, Messrs. Editors, have I transcribed the above plan for your work, which circulates pretty extensively among ministers and private christians, that they may read it, and consider whether there are any sufficient reasons against the establishment of the above denomination, or why the reasons urged in its favor are not conclusive.

D. W.

AN EXHIBITION OF UNITARIANISM, WITH SCRIPTURAL EXTRACTS.

SECTION III.

CHARACTER OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

American Unitarian Writers.

There is, perhaps, no term or phrase of frequent occurrence in the New Testament, with which readers in general are more perplexed, and concerning the meaning of which, they feel more doubtful, than that of "holy ghost," or "holy spirit,"—*Christ. Dis.* Vol. i. p. 260, *New Series.*

The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God.—1 Cor. 2 ; 14.

We endeavored to show, in our last number, that there is no plausible pretence, of scriptural evidence, for the existence of any being distinct from God the Father, called the Holy Spirit.—*Christ Dis.* Vol. ii. p. 365. *New Series.*

As to the Spirit, or a supposed third person in the divine nature, they (the scriptures) never mention it as an object of love, confidence, praise, or worship. No prayer, recorded in the bible, is addressed to the Father, Son, and Spirit. There is the same evidence, that God is one person, as that he is one being ; nor do the scriptures any where intimate, that he is three, in any sense whatever.—*Bailey's Sermons.* Sermon 1. p. 11.

But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, &c.—John 14 ; 26.

Baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.—Math. 28, 19.

Likewise, the Spirit also helpeth our infirmities ; for we know not what to pray for as we ought : but the Spirit itself maketh intercession for us, with groanings which cannot be uttered. And he that searcheth the hearts, knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit.—Rom. 8 ; 26, 27.

Few will assert, I believe, that the bible contains the record of divine worship being offered by inspired men to the Holy Ghost, or that the Holy Spirit is presented by the sacred writers, as the object of our worship. In the revelation of the New Testament, no duty to the Holy Ghost is enjoined, which men are to perform. We are neither commanded to love or to fear, honour or obey him ; nor to exercise towards him any devout affection.—*Bancroft's Sermons*, p. 78.

The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. Amen.—2 Cor. 13 ; 14.

And grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye are sealed unto the day of redemption.—Eph. 4 ; 30.

Quench not the Spirit.—2 Thess. 5 ; 19.

These terms, (Spirit, Spirit of God, Holy Ghost,) are all used in the bible, to express the MEANS with which God has been pleased to favor men, to enlighten their minds, and improve their dispositions.—*Bancroft's Sermons*, p. 87.

From the review of Scripture which we have taken, we find no proof of the existence of an ETERNAL SPIRIT distinct from God, possessing the attributes of Supreme Divinity and very God.—*Bancroft's Sermons*, p. 93.

How much more shall the blood of Christ, who, through the eternal Spirit, offered himself without spot to God, &c.—Heb. 9, 14.

OBITUARY.

FROM THE CHRISTIAN SPECTATOR.

It is a common and commendable practice, not only in our own country, but throughout the civilized world, to give some obituary notice of men who have been eminent for talents and piety ; and who have

deserved to have their memory embalmed, and handed down to posterity. The writer of the following article has been looking for, and expecting something of the kind ever since the death of that great and good man, the HON. JESSE ROOT. An expectation that it would be done by an abler pen has kept him from the attempt, until this late hour. But as no one has done it, a regard for the virtues, talents and superior excellencies of departed worth, has induced him to send you the following, to be disposed of as you see fit.

The HON. JESSE ROOT, who departed this life at his seat in Coventry, on the 29th of March 1822, was a native of that town. His ancestors were among the earliest and most respectable inhabitants of Coventry. His Father was Ebenezer Root, a worthy and valuable citizen, who came, when a youth from Northampton, with Thomas his Father. Thomas, the grand-father of Jesse Root, was the first Deacon of the church in Coventry. His mother was Sarah Strong, the daughter of Joseph Strong, whose father was, also, from Northampton, and one of the early inhabitants of Coventry.

The subject of this memoir was born January 1737. The present period affords no documents from which any particular and very interesting occurrences of his early life, or youthful days, can be disclosed, with one exception. It is known to have been the opinion of his pious parents, and such godly persons as were best acquainted with his earliest days, that he experienced the renewing influences of the Holy Spirit, at four years of age. It was confidently believed, by those best acquainted with him, that he was pious from his earliest childhood.

After improving his mind in childhood and youth, by such advantages as were to be enjoyed at a common school in a country town, steps were taken to prepare his mind for an education of an higher grade. His thirst for improvement led to a collegiate education. It was soon evident, as I was informed many years ago by his instructor in the first rudiments of the learned languages, that he had a mind above the common level. His progress was rapid, far beyond that of his fellow students. His academical education was at Nassau Hall, New Jersey, under the presidency of the celebrated BURR. He received the first honors of that institution in 1756, being then in the 20th year of his age.

At the close of his collegiate life, Mr. Root returned to Connecticut, his native State, and put himself in a course of preparation for the gospel Ministry, on which his heart was principally set. The Rev. Samuel Lockwood, afterwards the Rev. Dr. Lockwood, of Andover, a gentleman well known as an able, scientific and sound divine, and of great celebrity as a christian minister, with whom he resided, was his preceptor and guide in theological studies. On the 29th of March 1757, a little more than six months from his finishing his studies at College he was admitted as a Candidate for the Ministry. He was examined and licenced by a committee of the South Association of Hartford County. As a preacher he was able and acceptable. Popular talents added to a sound mind and pleasing manner, commanded the attention and respect of the judicious and good. But, in this employment he was not to continue. After preaching for some length of time, it is believed not more than two, or at most three years, he turned his mind

to the study of Law as a course of preparation for that professional business in which he was distinguished for many years.

That Mr. Root did not leave the desk for the bar from any degree of coldness towards the cause of Christ, nor any disaffection to the Christian ministry, we may be assured, from his long course of experimental and practical piety; as well as his high estimation of, and almost unparelled attachment to, the ministers of Christ. In him the faithful, dear minister of Jesus ever found an open hearted, sincere, affectionate friend. His house was the place of their resort; and he ever took a lively interest in their respectability, usefulness, and comfort.

The writer of this is very confident that in a free conversation with Judge Root not long before his decease, he observed that the death of a brother in the war with the French and Indians, in the year 1759, made such a derangement of family prospects and concerns, as rendered his continuance with his parents necessary—that this induced him to think of shifting his profession, and endeavoring to serve God, and his fellow men, in some other employment. To this course he was advised by the two principal and most influential Lawyers in this part of Connecticut, and who were active in his introduction to the bar. At the February Term in Windham County, in 1763, he was regularly admitted and licensed as an Attorney at Law.

For many years, Mr. Root was a learned and able Jurist, and one of the first and most powerful advocates at the bar of our courts. With frequent interruptions by the war of the revolution, and calls to important stations of honor and usefulness, he continued at the bar twenty seven years, until called to the bench of the Superior Court of this State.

He early took an active and lively interest in the concerns of his country in general; and especially in the dispute between the then Colonies and the mother country. As an able, upright patriot, he not only with his tongue, and pen, asserted the rights of his country, but held himself ready, whenever called, to risk his life in their defence. He possessed that spirit of true patriotism, which preferred an honorable death, in defence of the civil and religious rights of men, to ignominious vassalage; or the chief station among a horde of slaves. In obedience to the call of the beloved Washington, whose confidential friend he ever was, he made immediate preparations to give up the sweets of domestic life, and join the army of his country, then reduced to a small number, and in continual, and great danger of being overcome and ruined. This was about the close of 1776. He received a Captain's commission from the Governor of the State, bearing date Dec. 31st, 1776; enlisted a company in Hartford, where he then resided; and, within three days from the date of his commission, was on his march, with a full company of volunteers, to the aid of the distressed Father of his country. This commission, within a few days, was followed by an appointment to the rank of Lieut. Colonel of a Regiment, by the General Assembly of this State then in session. From this he was advanced, during the season, to the rank of Adjutant General to a department; in which station he served till honorably discharged by Maj. Gen. Putnam, the commander of the department. That branch of the army to which he was attached, being reduced to one Brigade, and the Regiment of volunteers, of which he was Lieut. Colonel, discharged; he returned to the duties

and enjoyments of domestic life, and to those of a faithful citizen in his native state. But his well known worth did not suffer him to continue long in private life. In May, 1779, he was chosen a Delegate to the Congress of the United States. In that station he was continued until the close of the war in 1783. In the most difficult and trying season which our country has witnessed—a period which “tried men’s souls,” he was one of the Governor’s council of safety—one of those judicious, faithful, energetic men, placed in a highly responsible station, and to whose care were committed the most interesting and important concerns of the State, and which involved the vital interests of the nation.

Mr. Root was repeatedly, and for a succession of years, elected to a seat at the Council board, as one of the upper house of Assembly.

In May, 1789, he was appointed an assistant Judge of the Superior Court of the State. In that station he served the public till the month of May, 1796, when he was appointed presiding Judge, and chief Justice of the State. This office he held, and faithfully discharged its arduous duties, till the session of the Assembly in May, 1807, when he voluntarily, and for important reasons, declined a re-appointment.

It was long a settled maxim with Judge Root, that offices of such high importance ought, in all cases, to be relinquished, while in the full vigor of mental powers; so that the interests of the community might not suffer through the imbecility and unavoidable incompetency of its public servants. On this ground, he gave up public business, and retired to private life at three score and ten. He took this step when he was as capable of public service as at any period of his life; and when no law forbid his continuance:—a mark of a great mind, and sound wisdom. No man, it is believed, has, in this State, performed the duties of these high and important stations to greater advantage, and more general satisfaction. Few have equalled him. Possessing a sound mind, and extensive legal science, with a happy and pleasing manner of communication, his remarks on the bench were engaging, and his decisions luminous and impressive, while his reasoning was forcible and conclusive. He presided with solemn dignity, and at the same time with ease and a lovely mildness.

Decision, and readiness to express, frankly, an opinion on all points of importance, as well in the private capacity of a social friend, as in that of a Judge on the seat of justice, entered, deeply, into the character of Judge Root.

It is equally true of him, that he was noted for punctuality in business. He would never admit the idea, that “there is time enough yet,” and this and that concern of weight might, for the present, be neglected. Impressed with the truth, that “now is the accepted time,” no appointment, no important business, was either neglected or postponed to a more “convenient season.”

A distinguishing and most excellent trait of character in Judge Root was eminent piety. This gave a lustre to all his other accomplishments, and put the finishing stroke to his character. Pious in early life, as he advanced in years he grew in religious knowledge, in spiritual and holy exercises of heart, in love to God and man, in experimental acquaintance with the truth of God’s word, with the connexion between this and the world to come, and with the influence of true faith upon all the duties and actions of life.

True piety is important and dignified in its appearance and influence in the lower stations and walks of life ; but more especially so in such as are exalted to rule over men ; to bear the civil sword, and be examples to their fellow-men. Religion in Judge Root appeared to uncommon advantage. It rendered him dignified on the seat of justice, venerable in the house of God, interesting in religious conference and prayer, useful in civil society, and lovely and pleasant as a private companion. The cause of Christ appeared to lie near his heart, and to possess the warmest affections of his soul. To promote and secure this, he was ready to sacrifice every other interest. He did not, as many have done, after pretending to preach Christ, when he shifted his profession, leave his religion behind him, crucify afresh the Son of God, and put him to open shame. He carried his religion from the desk to the bar. He found it a solace and support in adversity—the ground of animation and joy in prosperity—a sure guide to faithfulness in duty, and a pole-star directing his path to a peaceful and happy end of his labors.

It does not appear that Judge Root kept a regular diary, although among his papers are a large number of manuscripts on religious subjects. In one of these he recognizes a manifestation of God to his soul, in a transporting and almost overwhelming view of divine things.

It is dated Trenton, Dec. 22, 1782.

“Friday morning, the happiest I ever beheld. Although I have frequently experienced something like it, I never had my heart so ravished with the beauty of divine things—the excellent glory of God the Father—the infinite love, condescension, and mercy of Jesus Christ the Son, towards our ruined race ; and his boundless grace towards me, a poor, miserable, sinful creature. The view was so transporting, I was scarce able to compose myself to go down to my breakfast, or to conceal the tremor it produced in my nerves. Oh, my soul ! what a blessed foretaste of the joys of heaven, with which thou wilt forever solace thyself ! Oh ! what is the world and all its pleasures to one moment’s bliss ?—what all the friendship of the world compared to the divine unfailing love of this greatest and best of friends ?”

The glory of Christ, and his dignity, not only as the Son of God, but as God over all, he maintained with Christian ardor, and manly strength. He had a clear and impressive view of the bearing of this doctrine on the christian scheme in general. He did believe, and was ready to say, in the language of the Fathers, that it is *Articulus stantis et cadentis ecclesiæ*—that if this doctrine be given up, the basis of the church is destroyed—the gospel prostrated, and the foundation of the christian’s hope swept away.

Well does the writer of this recollect with what scriptural knowledge, strength of argument, and christian fervor, he defended this fundamental truth, when it was attacked in the church to which he belonged. While some were oppressed with great fear, that a bold opposition to the dangerous error, might cause division, and rend the society in pieces, he said to this effect, *No danger—the church is in good hands—God will take care of his own interest—We must pursue duty, and trust the issue with Him who has engaged to support his own cause.*

Judge Root was a practical man. He well knew that the purposes of God are accomplished by means ; and that we can trust in God for no desired good, only in putting forth suitable exertions to obtain it. While he firmly believed in experimental piety, he considered the comforting evidence as growing out of its effects. When piety exists in the heart, it shines in the life ; and when the heart is warmed by the love of God, acts of piety appear as its genuine fruit. So he believed, and could say with the Apostle, *Shew me thy faith without thy works, and I will shew thee my faith by my works.* It is thought it might have been said while he lived,

“ His fruits of holiness appear
Like clusters on the vine.”

He not only carefully attended all the public ordinances of religion ; but it was a steady and regular part of his christian labors to relieve the wants of the poor, to visit the chambers of distress, to converse, and pray with the sick and dying. The poor, the widow, and the fatherless around him, will remember his christian visits, his deeds of liberality and love. The poet seems to have portrayed his character, emphatically :

“ His liberal favors he extends,
To some he gives, to others lends ;
A generous pity fills his mind ;
Yet what his charity impairs,
He saves by prudence in affairs,
And thus he's just to all mankind.”

Though Judge Root lived to a great age, it could not be said he outlived his usefulness. His reason and judgment, as well as bodily activity, held out to an uncommon degree. He was able to attend conferences and prayer meetings, and take an active part, at the advanced age of 85 years.

He cheerfully, and even to the last, devoted a portion of his time and strength to the rising generation ; and was active and diligent in superintending schools, and laboring to render effectual the means of education. No longer than one week before his departure, he spent the day in visiting schools, and instructing the children and youth. He returned in the evening from this service, sat up late, read some religious publications that he had received in the course of the day, retired to rest, and went out no more.

His last illness was short, only seven days, and extremely distressing. The distresses of the body, however, did not overcome and destroy his mental powers, nor shake his hope in God. His great mind withstood the wreck of nature, and looked with calm serenity, and a native dignity, above the cloud. He possessed a placid and serene mind, lively hopes, quiet submission, and exemplary patience. When asked in the course of his illness, if he did not think it his *last*, he replied, with a smile, “ I don't know—I have been very sick several times, and recovered—But one thing I know, it will be as God pleases.”

A lively view of the evil of sin, and of the greatness of his own sin, entered deeply into his feelings. He most freely acknowledged himself a great sinner ; but added, as a comforting ground of hope,

"We have a great Saviour." Hence, one of his last and most feeling prayers, "Pardon my sin, O Lord, for it is great." The infinite fullness of the atonement, and that resting entirely on the Deity of Christ, was all his hope. In view of this, he was filled with animation and joy. Conversing but a day or two before his death, on divine things, he appeared to be peculiarly animated, and by joyful anticipations, to rise above the world. At length, after a short pause, he said, "I must attend a little to my temporal affairs; appearing, as the friend conversing with him observed, that it was difficult to bring down his mind from the height he was soaring, and the glory he was contemplating, to attend to the grovelling trifles of the world.

On the morning previous to his death, he was thought by himself and his friends, to be actually dying. But he revived and struggled through the day. At the close of the day on the evening of which he died, and about the setting of the sun, he said to his daughter who stood by him, "I sat out on a pleasant journey in the morning, and I shall get through to-night." These were the last words he distinctly uttered. And so it was—his journey ended and his life closed, early in the evening. Thus lived, and thus died, the Hon. JESSE ROOT.

Mark the perfect man, and behold the upright; for the end of that man is peace.

APHORISMS.

Sanctified afflictions are spiritual promotions; and sufferings are often the best preferments.

In all his dispensations, Christ chooses rather to profit his people, than to please them.

A believer's rejoicing in the Lord should be like Ezekiel's river; without end and without bounds.

ANECDOTE.

Col. Ethan Allen was a bold officer in the American revolution. He could face the enemies of his country with the most undaunted bravery, and in the field of battle he never shrank from danger. But he was an opposer to christianity, and gloried in the character of an infidel. His wife, however, was a pious woman, and taught her children in the ways of piety, while he told them it was all a delusion. But there was an hour coming, when Col. Allen's confidence in his own sentiments would be closely tried. A beloved daughter was taken sick—He received a message that she was dying—He hastened to her bed side anxious to hear her dying words. "Father," said she, "I am about to die; shall I believe in the principles which you have taught me, or shall I believe what my mother has taught me? This was an affecting scene. The intrepid Colonel became extremely agitated: his chin quivered; his whole frame shook; and after waiting a few moments he replied, "*Believe what your mother has taught you.*"

WRITTEN DURING A RELIGIOUS REVIVAL

Behold the beams of heavenly light
 Shine through the shades of moral night,
 And heaven its mercy showers ;
 Those who had long in darkness been,
 And bowed the willing slaves of sin,
 Now rouse their slumb'ring powers.

As showers of rain on thirsty lands,
 As cooling streams mid barren sands
 The traveller revive ;
 So sinners, who, in works were dead,
 Fly to the Gospel pool for aid ;—
 They drink the stream and live.

Those who have scorn'd a Saviour's blood,
 And braved the threat'nings of their God,
 Now worship at the cross ;
 And those, who sought from worldly toys,
 Substantial peace and lasting joys,
 Now count their gold but dross.

Those hearts where pride but lately reigned,
 Now mourn with penitence unfeigned
 The evils they have done ;
 And those, who sought by works for heaven,
 Now build their hope of sins forgiven
 By faith in Christ alone.

Those who have danced in pleasure's maze,
 Now turn their feet in wisdom's ways,
 And seek the narrow road ;
 The world they quit without a tear,
 Resolved the heavenly course to steer,
 Confiding in their God.

Surprising change ! the love how great
 That saved them from their ruined state,
 And brought the rebels in ;
 May none have cause to cry at last,
 " The summer's o'er, the harvest's past,
 And we are slaves to sin."

Father benign ! still may thy grace
 Descend upon thy fallen race,
 'Till all shall bless thy name ;
 May every creature praises sing
 To thee the great eternal King,
 The Spirit and the Lamb.

CORNELIA.

To Correspondents.—"YODH ;" "A ;" and "Cyparissa" will be admitted.
 Several communications without signature have been received.

TO SUBSCRIBERS.

Those Subscribers for the Evangelist, who have not paid in advance, are reminded, that pay for the volume became due, on the delivery of the sixth number.

CONDITIONS.

The work will be issued in monthly numbers, each number containing 40 pages octavo; and will be printed on good paper, with new type.

The price of the work will be \$2 00 a year, payable on the delivery of the sixth number. Those who pay on the delivery of the first or second number, the price will be \$1 75.

Those who procure six subscribers, and become responsible for the payment of the same, shall receive the seventh copy as a compensation.

It is expected, that all communications with the editor, will be post paid, excepting such as are written for the work.

No subscriptions will be taken for a less term than one year; and, if notice of discontinuance is not given before the issuing of the last number in the year, the subscribers will be considered as holden for the succeeding year.

The Evangelist will be published on the third Saturday of every month, at the Mirror Office, corner of Asylum and Main streets, where all orders will be promptly answered.